

JUNE 28 - 30, 2005 NORFOLK CONVENTION CENTER

Assessments Track

Integration Into the FORCEnet Assessment Process

Dr. Clifton B. Phillips


Associate Technical Director,
PEO C4I and Space
30 Jun 2005





Global Information Grid







PEO Considerations



- Value: What is the best buy?
- Sensitivity: How much performance can I get per unit costs?
- Timing: What is the best programmatic phasing for acquiring NCW Capability?
- Impact to Operations: Is the NCW enabling or enhancing?
- Strategic partnerships: Have all the leveraging opportunities been exploited?

• ...



Vision



- Create a standardized modeling object associated with each system (as-is and to-be) in the roadmap
 - Determine critical parameters for capability attributes
 - Ensure models measure those attributes
 - Determine critical system parameters that support those attributes
- Will allow M&S team to build platforms with accurate depiction of proposed system capabilities
 - Standard modeling object per Platform, associated with Platform Implementation Plan
 - Platform Implementation Plan related to NCW Levels
- Enable more accurate simulation of C4I systems
 - Standardized, accurate, repeatable, modeling that depicts C4I impacts on campaigns, both at system and platform levels, representing capability achieved by technology changes over time




Proposed Enhancement

Map operational capabilities from MCPs to **FORCEnet** Capability list to platform NCW Levels

Allow for

warfighting analysis while understanding the value of NWC capabilities



Link technical vision to operational needs



PEO/SPAWAR Team Capability / Platform / System / Modeling



- Standardized modeling object associated with each system
 - NSS selected as Campaign-level model, 051 to map system performance data to model attributes
 - Attributes to be aligned to NESI criteria
 - NCW Platform effort to align to NESI ongoing
 - Platforms aligned to systems via PEO Platform Implementation Plan
 - Need to align systems to NESI
 - Identify shortfalls



Assessments of FORCEnet Capabilities



Capabilities Layer needs (output points)


- Scoring measure
- Sensitivity ranking
- Operational Capability
- Technical Value Assessment

Requirements Layer

- Assess enhancements
- Assess enablers
- Break out dependencies
- Input measures of reach ability

Functions Layer (input points)

- Image of DoDAF products
- •Input enhancements at lowest level



Proper assessment allows visibility into return on investments from a variety of layers.



Need for improvement




- Current investment strategy requires better connection between operational capability analysis and the value of increased technical capabilities
 - i.e. NCW levels
 - Relationship between Warfighting Wholeness, Platform Wholeness and Fn
- Establish mechanism to quantify the impact a given technical capability will have on the campaign
 - i.e.
 - Will converting NCW level 1 systems to a SOA (NCW 2) be worth the cost?
 - Would implementing a cross domain solution X provide value to CVN, DDG or a P-3?
- Modeling each NCW level will provide an to understanding to the impact of a given technology on the campaign



Link between Platform Wholeness, FCL and NCW levels


engineering conference






Getting The Prescription Right - Transport Example





Evaluated several comms programs by parameters such as function, user Service, and frequency band ...

Line up multiple communications programs to see where programmatic functionalities can be combined, and then establish break points for NCW Readiness levels.



Aircraft

Big Decks


Ships

TRO TR2

Shore

Align Naval capabilities by TR levels first by platform, and then by BG/ESG.

ESG deployed with similar technology readiness across the strike group. Increases in TR levels considered across the Naval Force. FORCEnet evolves at an effective and



affordable pace.